DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 035 PS 026 301

AUTHOR Popenoe, David
TITLE Life without Father.
PUB DATE 1997-11-00
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the NCFR Fatherhood and Motherhood in a Diverse and Changing World (59th, Arlington, VA, November 7-10, 1997).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression; *Child Rearing; Children; Cultural Influences; Delinquency; Family (Sociological Unit); *Fatherless Family; *Fathers; *Marriage; One Parent Family; Parent Influence; *Parent Role; Sexuality; Social Problems; Sociocultural Patterns; *Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

The increasing percentage of children living apart from their natural fathers is an unpredicted, and not widely discussed, trend. Fatherlessness is a major force behind many disturbing U.S. social problems. The institution of marriage acts as culture's chief vehicle to bind men to their children. The absence of fathers from children's lives is one of the most important causes of problems related to children's well-being such as increasing rates of juvenile violent crime, depression and eating disorders, teen suicide, and substance abuse. The economic difficulties experienced by mother-headed families ultimately account for many of the disadvantages found among fatherless children. Fathers make unique contributions to child rearing, including a parenting style different from mothers and an emphasis on play, which facilitates normal emotional development. The largest negative consequence of father absence is juvenile delinquency and violence, and early sexual activity. Marriage and childrearing act as extremely important civilizing forces for men; when there are large numbers of young, unattached males concentrated in one place, there are increases in social disorder. It is necessary to undo the cultural shift toward radical individualism to restore marriage and reinstate fathers in their children's lives. Changes in the attitudes and actions of employers, religious leaders, family scholars, marriage counselors, legislators, and the entertainment industry could strengthen the institution of marriage. Fathers' role must be redefined to involve full engagement in their children's development from the beginning. (Contains 33 references.) (KB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 416 035

Life Without Father*

David Popenoe

David Popenoe

The decline of fatherhood is one of the most basic, unexpected and extraordinary trends of our time. Its dimensions can be captured in a single statistic: In just three decades, between 1960 and 1990, the percentage of children living apart from their natural fathers more than doubled, from 17 percent to 36 percent. If this trend continues, by early in the next century nearly half of all American children will be going to sleep each evening without being able to say good night to their dads.

No one predicted this trend; few researchers or government agencies have monitored it; and it is not widely discussed, even today. But the decline of fatherhood is a major force behind many of the most disturbing problems that plague American society: crime and juvenile delinquency; premature sexuality and out-of-wedlock births to teenagers; deteriorating educational achievement; depression, substance abuse and alienation among adolescents; and the growing number of women and children in poverty.

The current generation of children and youth may be the first in our nation's history to be less well off--psychologically, socially, economically, and morally--than their parents were at the same age. Indeed, as Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan has observed, "the United States may be the first society in history in which children are distinctly worse off than adults."[1]

Even as this calamity unfolds, our cultural view of fatherhood, itself, is changing. Few people doubt the fundamental importance of mothers. But fathers? More and more, the question of whether fathers are really necessary is being raised. Many would answer no, or maybe not. And to the degree that fathers are still thought necessary,

PS 026301

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

fatherhood is said by many to be merely a social role that others can play: mothers, partners, stepfathers, uncles and aunts, grandparents. Perhaps the script can even be rewritten and the role changed--or dropped.

There was a time in the past when fatherlessness was far more common than it is today, but death was to blame, not divorce and out-of-wedlock births. In early-17th-century Virginia, only an estimated 31 percent of white children reached age 18 with both parents still alive.[2] Today, well over 90 percent of America's youngsters reach 18 with two living parents. Almost all of today's fatherless children have fathers who are alive, well, and perfectly capable of shouldering the responsibilities of fatherhood. Who would ever have thought that so many men would choose to relinquish them?

Not so long ago, the change in the cause of fatherlessness was dismissed as irrelevant in many quarters, including among social scientists. Children, it was said, are merely losing their parents in a different way than they used to. You don't hear that very much anymore. A surprising finding of recent social-science research is that it is decidedly worse for a child to lose a father in the modern, voluntary way than through death. The children of divorce and never-married mothers are less successful in life by almost every measure than the children of widowed mothers.[3] The replacement of death by divorce as the prime cause of fatherlessness, then, is a monumental setback in the history of childhood.

Until the 1960s, the falling death rate and the rising divorce rate neutralized each other. In 1900, the percentage of all American children living in single-parent families was 8.5 percent. By 1960, it had increased to just 9.1 percent. But then the decline in the death rate slowed, and the divorce rate skyrocketed. "The scale of marital breakdowns in the West since 1960 has no historical precedent that I know of, and

seems unique," says Lawrence Stone, the noted Princeton University family historian. "There has been nothing like it for the last 2,000 years, and probably longer."[4]

In theory, divorce need not mean disconnection. In reality, it often does. One large survey in the late 1980s found that about one in five divorced fathers had not seen his children the past year, and less than half of divorced fathers saw their children more than several times a year.[5] A 1981 survey of adolescents who were living apart from their fathers found that 52 percent had not seen them at all in more than a year; only 16 percent saw their fathers as often as once a week.[6]

The picture grows worse. Just as divorce has overtaken death as the leading cause of fatherlessness, out-of-wedlock births are expected to surpass divorce later in the 1990s. They accounted for 32 percent of all births by 1995, an increase from a mere five percent in 1960. And there is substantial evidence that having an unmarried father is even worse for a child than having a divorced father.

FATHERS: ESSENTIAL BUT PROBLEMATIC

Across time and cultures, fathers have always been considered essential--and not just for their sperm. Marriage and the nuclear family--mother, father and children--are the most universal social institutions in existence. In no society has the birth of children out of wedlock been the cultural norm. To the contrary, a concern for the legitimacy of children is nearly universal.

At the same time, being a father is universally problematic for men. While mothers the world over bear and nurture their young with an intrinsic acknowledgment and, most commonly, acceptance of their role, the process of taking on the role of father is often filled with conflict and doubt. The source of this sex-role difference can be plainly stated. Men are not biologically as attuned to being committed fathers as women

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

are to being committed mothers. The evolutionary logic is clear. Women, who can bear only a limited number of children, have a great incentive to invest their energy in rearing children, while men, who can father many offspring, do not. Left culturally unregulated, men's sexual behavior can be promiscuous, their paternity casual, their commitment to families weak.[7]

This is not to say that the role of father is foreign to male nature. Far from it. Evolutionary scientists tell us that the development of the fathering capacity and high paternal investments in offspring--features not common among our primate relatives--have been sources of enormous evolutionary advantage for human beings.

In recognition of the fatherhood problem, human cultures have used sanctions to bind men to their children, and of course the institution of marriage has been culture's chief vehicle. Marriage is society's way of signaling that the community approves and encourages sexual intercourse and the birth of children, and that the long-term relationship of the parents is socially important.

FATHERLESSNESS AND CHILDREN

In my many years as a sociologist, I have found few other bodies of evidence that lean so much in one direction as this one: On the whole, two parents--a father and a mother--are better for a child than one parent. There are, to be sure, many factors that complicate this simple proposition. We all know of a two-parent family that is truly dysfunctional--the proverbial family from hell. A child can certainly be raised to a fulfilling adulthood by one loving parent who is devoted to the child's well-being. But such exceptions do not invalidate the rule any more than the fact that some three-pack-a-day smokers live to a ripe old age casts doubt on the dangers of cigarettes.

The collapse of children's well-being in the United States has reached breathtaking proportions. Juvenile violent crime has increase sixfold, from 16,000 arrests in 1960 to 96,000 in 1992. Eating disorders and rates of depression have soared among adolescent girls. Teen suicide has tripled. Alcohol and drug abuse among teen-agers, although it has leveled off in recent years, continues at a very high rate. Poverty has shifted from the elderly to the young. Of all the nation's poor today, 38 percent are children.[8]

One can think of many explanations for these unhappy developments: the growth of commercialism and consumerism, the influence of television and the mass media, the decline of religion, the widespread availability of guns and addictive drugs, and the decay of social order and neighborhood relationships. None of these causes should be dismissed. But the evidence is now strong that the absence of fathers from the lives of children is one of the most important causes.

The most tangible and immediate consequence of fatherlessness for children is the loss of economic resources. By the best recent estimates, the income of the household in which a child remains after a divorce instantly declines by about 21 percent per capita on average, while expenses tend to go up.[9] Over time, the economic situation for the child often deteriorates further.

The proliferation of mother-headed families now constitutes something of a national economic emergency. About a quarter of all family groups with children--more than half of all black family groups--are headed by mothers, which is almost double the 11.5 percent figure in 1970.[10] No other group is so poor, and none stays poor longer. Poverty afflicts nearly one out of every two of these families, but fewer than one in 10 married-couple families. In recent years, mother-headed families have accounted for 94 percent of caseloads for Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).[11]

Economic difficulties--which translate into poorer schooling and other handicaps--ultimately account for a considerable share of the disadvantages found among fatherless children. By the best recent estimates, however, economic status accounts for no more than half of these disadvantages. The latest and most authoritative review of the research concluded that children who grow up with only one of their biological parents (nearly always the mother) are twice as likely to drop out of high school, 2.5 times as likely to become teen mothers, and 1.4 times as likely to be idle--out of school and out of work--as children who grow up with both parents.[12]

Such conclusions will no longer come as a surprise to many Americans. Yet it was not so long ago that the divorce revolution was given a strangely positive cast in American popular culture. If breaking up is better for parents, it was thought, it cannot be all that bad for children. What keeps parents happy should also keep children happy.[13] In part, this was a convenient, guilt-retarding rationalization for parents who were breaking up. Recent evidence throws such sentiments in serious doubt.

WHAT DO FATHERS DO?

Few people doubt the fundamental importance of mothers, but what do fathers do? Much of what they contribute to the growth of their children, of course, is simply the result of being a second adult in the home. Bringing up children is demanding, stressful and often exhausting. Two adults cannot only support and spell each other; they can offset each other's deficiencies and build on each other's strengths.

Fathers also bring an array of unique qualities. Some are familiar: protector and role model. Teen-age boys without fathers are notoriously prone to trouble. The pathway to adulthood for daughters is somewhat easier, but they still must learn from their fathers, in ways they cannot from their mothers, how to relate to men. They learn

from their fathers about heterosexual trust, intimacy and difference. They learn to appreciate their own femininity from the one male who is most special in their lives. Most important, through loving and being loved by their fathers, they learn that they are loveworthy.

Recent research has given us much deeper--and more surprising--insights into the father's role in childrearing.[14] It shows that in almost all of their interactions with children, fathers do things a little differently from mothers. What fathers do--their special parenting style--is not only highly complementary to what mothers do but is by all indications important in its own right for optimum childrearing.

For example, an often-overlooked dimension of fathering is play. From their children's birth through adolescence, the father's style of play seems to have unusual significance. It is likely to be both physically stimulating and exciting. With older children it involves more physical games and teamwork requiring the competitive testing of physical and mental skills. It frequently resembles an apprenticeship or teaching relationship: come on, let me show you how.

Mothers typically spend more time playing with their children, but theirs is a different kind of play. Mothers' play tends to take place more at the child's level. Mothers provide the child with the opportunity to direct the play, to be in charge, to proceed at the child's own pace.

The way fathers play has effects on everything from the management of emotions to intelligence and academic achievement. It is particularly important in promoting self-control. According to one expert, "children who roughhouse with their fathers quickly learn that biting, kicking and other forms of physical violence are not acceptable."[15] They learn when to "shut it down."

Children, a committee assembled by the Board on Children and Families of the National Research Council concluded, "learn critical lessons about how to recognize and deal with highly charged emotions in the context of playing with their fathers. Fathers, in effect, give children practice in regulating their own emotions and recognizing others' emotional clues."[16] The findings of a study of convicted murderers in Texas are probably not the product of coincidence: 90 percent of them either did not play as children or played abnormally.[17]

At play and in other realms fathers tend to stress competition, challenge, initiative, risk-taking and independence. Mothers, in contrast, stress emotional security and personal safety. On the playground, fathers will try to get the child to swing ever higher, higher than the person on the next swing, while mothers will be cautious, worrying about accidents.

It's sometimes said that fathers express more concern for the child's longer term development, while mothers focus on the child's immediate well-being (which, of course, in its own way has everything to do with a child's long-term well-being.) What is clear is that children have dual needs that must be met. Becoming a mature and competent adult involves the integration of two often-contradictory human desires: for communion, or the feeling of being included, connected, and related, and for agency, which entails individuality and independence. One without the other is a denuded and impaired humanity, an incomplete realization of the human potential.[18]

For some couples, to be sure, these functions are not rigidly divided along standard female-male lines. There may even be a role reversal in some cases, with men largely assuming the female style and women the male style. But these are exceptions that prove the rule. Gender-differentiated parenting is of such importance

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that in child rearing by homosexual couples, either gay or lesbian, one partner commonly fills the male-instrumental role while the other fills the female-expressive role.

It is ironic, however, that in our public discussion of fathering, it's seldom acknowledged that fathers have a distinctive role to play. Indeed, it's far more often said that fathers should be more like mothers. While this is often said with the best of intentions, the effects are perverse. After all, if fathering is no different from mothering, males can easily be replaced in the home by women. It might even seem better to do so. Already viewed as a burden and obstacle to self-fulfillment, fatherhood thus comes to seem superfluous and unnecessary as well.

FATHERLESSNESS AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

What fathers do, and don't do, is directly implicated in many of our most grievous social ills. Of all the negative consequences of father absence, juvenile delinquency and violence--too many little boys with guns--probably loom largest in the public mind. Reported violent crime soared 550 percent since 1960, and juveniles have had the fastest-growing crime rate. Arrests of juveniles for murder, for example, rose 128 percent between 1983 and 1992.

Many people intuitively believe that fatherlessness is related to delinquency and violence, and the weight of research evidence supports this belief.[19] Having a father at home is no guarantee that a youngster won't commit a crime, but it appears to be an excellent form of protection. Sixty percent of America's rapists, 72 percent of its adolescent murderers, and 70 percent of its long-term prison inmates come from fatherless homes.[20]

Fathers are important to their sons as role models. They are important for maintaining authority and discipline. And they are important in helping their sons to

develop both self-control and feelings of empathy toward others, character traits that are found to be lacking in violent youth.

The twin to the nightmare specter of too many little boys with guns is too many little girls with babies. During the past three decades, there has been a dramatic increase in the percentage of teenagers engaging in sexual activity. About one million teen pregnancies occur in the United States each year, giving this nation the highest teen pregnancy rate in the industrialized world.

Fatherlessness is again a major contributing factor. Analyzing data from the National Child Development Study, for example, a major British longitudinal study that followed the lives of thousands of children born in 1958, researcher Kathleen Kiernan found that young women with divorced or separated parents are more likely to form unions in their teens, to have a child at an early age, and to bear children outside of marriage. Kiernan highlighted one important characteristic that opens the door to other problems: girls from single-parent families are more likely to leave home at an early age than other girls.[21]

Fathers are the first and most important men in the lives of girls. They provide male role models, accustoming their daughters to male-female relationships. Engaged and responsive fathers play with their daughters and guide them into challenging activities. They protect them, providing them with a sense of physical and emotional security. Girls with adequate fathering are more able, as they grow older, to develop constructive heterosexual relationships based on trust and intimacy.

On the face of it, there would seem to be at least one potentially positive side to fatherlessness: Without a father around the house, the incidence of child abuse might be expected to drop. Unfortunately, reports of child neglect and abuse have skyrocketed since 1976. One of the greatest risk factors in child abuse, found by

virtually every investigation that has ever been conducted, is family disruption, especially living in a female-headed single-parent household.[22] Most of the perpetrators of sexual abuse are men. But less that half of the offenders are family members and close relatives. 10 to 30 percent are strangers, and the remainder are acquaintances of various kinds, including neighbors, peers and mother's boyfriends.

Why does living without a father pose such hazards for children? Two explanations are usually given: the children receive less supervision and protection from men their mothers bring home, and they are also more emotionally deprived, which leaves them vulnerable to sexual abusers who entrap them by offering affection, attention and friendship. Even a diligent absent father can't supervise or protect his children the way a live-in father can. Nor is he likely to have the kind of relationship with his daughter that is usually needed to give her a foundation of emotional security and a model for nonsexual relationships with men.[23]

FATHERHOOD, MARRIAGE AND MEN

The benefits of active fatherhood do not all flow to the child. Men, too, suffer grievously from the growth of fatherlessness. The world over, young and unattached young males have always been a cause for social concern. They can be a danger to themselves and to society. Young unattached men tend to be more aggressive, violent, promiscuous, and prone to substance abuse; they are also more likely to die prematurely through disease, accidents, or self-neglect. They make up the majority of deviants, delinquents, criminals, killers, drug users, vice lords, and miscreants of every kind. Wherever large numbers of young, unattached males are concentrated in one place, the probability of social disorder greatly increases. Two trenchant examples are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the nineteenth-century American frontier West and the late twentieth-century inner-city ghetto.[24]

Family life--marriage and childrearing--is an extremely important civilizing force for men. It encourages them to develop those habits of character--including prudence, cooperativeness, honesty, trust and self-sacrifice--that can lead to achievement as an economic provider. Marriage also focuses male sexual energy. Having children typically impresses on men the importance of setting a good example. Who hasn't heard at least one man say that he gave up irresponsible actions only when he married and had children?

Empirical evidence exists to substantiate these reports. One longitudinal study of men's first two years of fatherhood found that prior to fatherhood, the men's identities centered on independence, aggressiveness, and self-concerns, whereas following fatherhood their identities included strong elements of caring and empathy.[25] Another longitudinal study of men found that fatherhood promoted male maturity, especially the ability of men to integrate their own feelings and to understand others sympathetically.[26]

The civilizing effect of being a father is highlighted by a path breaking social-improvement endeavor in Cleveland. In the inner-city Hough neighborhood, social worker Charles Ballard has been turning around the lives of young black men through his Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization. Since 1982, using an intensive social-work approach that includes home visits, parenting programs, and group therapy sessions, he has reunited more than 2,000 absent, unwed fathers with their children.

The standard theory is that if you want inner-city men like these to be responsible fathers, you first must find them a job. But Ballard has stood this theory on

its head. His approach is that you first must convince the young men of the importance of being a good father, and then they will be motivated to finish school and find work.

An independent evaluation of his approach showed that it really works. Only 12 percent of the young men had full-time work when they entered his program, but 62 percent later found such work, and another 12 percent found part-time jobs. Ninety-seven percent of the men he dealt with began providing financial support for their children, and 71 percent had no additional children out of wedlock.[27]

Marriage by itself, even without the presence of children, is also a major civilizing force for men. No other institution save religion (and perhaps the military) places such moral demands on men. To be sure, there is a selection factor in marriage. Those men whom women would care to marry already have some of the civilized virtues. And those men who are morally beyond the pale have difficulty finding mates. Yet epidemiological studies and social surveys have shown that marriage has a civilizing effect independent of the selection factor. Marriage actually promotes health, competence, virtue and personal well-being.[28] With the continued growth of fatherlessness, we can expect to see a nation of men who are at worst morally out of control and at best unhappy, unhealthy, and unfulfilled.

FATHERHOOD AND WOMEN

Another group that has suffered in the new age of fatherlessness is, of course, women. There is no doubt that many women get along very well without men in their lives, and that having the wrong men in their lives can be unfortunate, even disastrous. But just as it seems to increase assaults on children, fatherlessness appears to generate more violence against women.

Partly this is a matter of arithmetic. More than two-thirds of violence (assault, robbery and rape) against women is committed by unrelated acquaintances or strangers.[29] As the number of unattached males in the population goes up, so does the incidence of violence toward women.

Or consider the fact that, of the violence toward women that *is* committed by intimates and other relatives, only 29 percent involves a current spouse, whereas 42 percent involves a close friend or partner and another 12 percent an ex-spouse.[30] As current spouses are replaced by nonspouses and exes, violence toward women increases.

In fact, marriage appears to be a strong safety factor for women. A satisfactory marriage between sexually faithful partners, especially when they are raising their own children, engenders fewer risks for violence than probably any other circumstance in which a woman could find herself. Recent surveys of violent-crime victimization have found that only 12.6 of every 1,000 married women fall victim to violence, compared with 43.9 of every 1,000 never-married women and 66.5 of every 1,000 divorced or separated women.[31]

REESTABLISHING FATHERHOOD AND MARRIAGE

Just as cultural forms can be discarded, dismantled and declared obsolete, so can they be regenerated. In order to restore marriage and reinstate fathers in the lives of their children, we are somehow going to have to undo the cultural shift of the past few decades toward radical individualism. We can't return to the so-called Ozzie and Harriet, breadwinner-housewife family of the fifties; that time has passed. And no one wants to return to loveless marriages held together only by economic interdependence.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

But there are ways to strengthen the institution of marriage, and thereby the husband-wife nuclear family that stays together and actively and responsibly raises its children.

Employers, for example, can provide generous parental leave and experiment with more flexible work hours. Religious leaders can reclaim moral ground from the culture of divorce and nonmarriage by resisting the temptation to equate "committed relationships" with marriage. Family scholars and educators can avoid equating the intact, two-parent family with "alternative life styles." Marriage counselors can begin with a bias *in favor of* marriage, stressing the needs of the family at least as much as the needs of the client. Legislators can remove marriage penalties from the tax codes and provide more favorable tax treatment for childrearing couples. As for the entertainment industry, pressure already is being brought to curtail the glamorization of unwed motherhood, marital infidelity and sexual promiscuity. This pressure should be dramatically expanded.

Premarital education and marital enrichment programs should be expanded across the land. We should consider a two-tier system of divorce law: marriages without minor children would be relatively easy to dissolve, but marriages with children would be subject to stricter guidelines. Longer waiting periods for divorcing couples with children might be called for, combined with greater access to marriage counseling.

The father's role must also be redefined in a way that neglects neither historical models nor unique attributes of modern societies, the new roles for women, and the special qualities that men bring to childrearing. Above all, fathers should be taught that fathering is more than merely providing food, clothing and shelter to children and letting mothers take care of the rest. Fathers should become fully engaged in their children's social and psychological development from day one and provide their children with continuing reassurance of their love and devotion.

What the decline of fatherhood and marriage in America really means is that slowly, insidiously, and relentlessly our society has been moving in an ominous direction. If we are to make progress toward a more just and humane society, we must reverse the tide that is pulling fathers apart from their families. Nothing is more important for our children or for our future as a nation.

---

*Adapted from David Popenoe, Life Without Father: Compelling New Evidence that Fatherhood and Marriage are Indispensable for the Good of Children and Society (New York: Free Press, 1996). A longer version of this article appeared as "A World Without Fathers" in The Wilson Quarterly, Spring, 1996. pp.12-29.

[1] New York Times, Sept. 25, 1986, p. C7.

[2] D. B. Rutman and A. H. Rutman. A Place in Time: Middlesex County, Virginia, 1650-1750 (New York: Norton, 1984)

[3] Sara McLanahan and Gary Sandefur, Growing Up With a Single Parent (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994) pp. 67-68.

[4] Lawrence Stone. 1989. "The Road to Polygamy" New York Review of Books, Mar. 2, pp. 12-15 (p. 14)

[5] Judith A. Seltzer. 1991. "Relationships Between Fathers and Children Who Live Apart: The Father's Role After Separation." Journal of Marriage and the Family 53:79-101.

[6] Frank Furstenberg, Jr. and Christine W. Nord. 1985. "Parenting Apart: Patterns of Childbearing After Marital Disruption." Journal of Marriage and the Family 47:893-905; Frank Furstenberg, Jr., Christine W. Nord, James L. Peterson, and Nicholas Zill. 1983. "The Life Course of Children of Divorce: Marital Disruption and Parental Contact." American Sociological Review 48:656-658.

[7] For a popular introduction to the new field of evolutionary psychology, see Robert Wright. 1994. The Moral Animal (New York: Vintage Books).

[8] Data sources can be found in Popenoe, 1996.

[9] Judith Seltzer. 1994. "Consequences of Marital Dissolution for Children." Annual Review of Sociology 20:235-266 (esp. 244).

[10] Terry Lugaila. 1992. Households, Families and Children: A Thirty-Year Perspective. Current Population Reports P23-181. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

[11] Irwin Garfinkel and Sara S. McLanahan. 1986. Single Mothers and Their Children: A New American Dilemma. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

[12] McLanahan and Sandefur. op. cit.

[13] Barbara Dafoe Whitehead. 1997. The Divorce Culture. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

[14] Data sources can be found in Popenoe, 1996, Ch. 5.

[15] John Snarey. 1993. How Fathers Care for the Next Generation (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993. pp. 35-36.

[16] Nancy A. Crowell and Ethel M Leeper, eds. 1994. America's Fathers and Public Policy. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, p. 8.

[17] Reported in Kim A. McDonald. 1995. "The Secrets of Animal Play." Chronicle of Higher Education, July 13, pp. A9-A13.

[18] E. Greenberger. 1984. "Defining Psychosocial Maturity in Adolescence." Pp. 3-39 in P. Karoly and J. J. Steffen, eds., Adolescent Behavior Disorders: Foundation and Contemporary Concerns. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

[19] The evidence is reviewed in Popenoe, 1996, Chs. 2 and 5.

[20] Data provided by the National Fatherhood Initiative, Gaithersburg, MD.

[21] Kathleen E. Kiernan. 1992. "The Impact of Family Disruptions in Childhood on Transitions Made in Young Adult Life." Population Studies 46:213-234.

[22] The evidence is reviewed in Popenoe, 1996, Ch. 2.

[23] See David Finkelhor. 1994. "Current Information on the Scope and Nature of Child Sexual Abuse." Future of Children 4(2):31-53.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[24] David T. Courtwright. 1996. Violent Land: Single Men and Social Disorder from the Frontier to the Inner City. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[25] Carolyn Pape Cowan and P. A. Cowan. 1987. "Men's Involvement in Parenthood: Identifying the Antecedents and Understanding the Barriers." Pp. 145-174 in P. W. Berman and F. A. Pedersen, eds., Men's Transitions to Parenthood: Longitudinal Studies of Early Family Experience. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. See also C. P. Cowan and P. A. Cowan. 1992. When Partners Become Parents. New York: Basic Books.

[26] D. H. Heath. 1978. "What Meaning and Effects Does Fatherhood Have for the Maturing of Professional Men?" Merrill-Palmer Quarterly 24(4):265-278. See also D. H. Heath and H. E. Heath. 1991. Fulfilling Lives: Paths to Maturity and Success. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

[27] Reported in U. S. News and World Report, February 27, 1995, p. 45.

[28] Robert H. Coombs. 1991. "Marital Status and Personal Well-Being: A Literature Review." Family Relations 40:97-102; Walter R. Gove, C. B. Style and M. Hughes. 1990. "The Effect of Marriage on the Well-Being of Adults." Journal of Family Issues 11(1):4-35; Arne Mastekaasa. 1992. "Marriage and Psychological Well-Being: Some Evidence on Selection into Marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family 54:901-911; Linda J. Waite. 1995. "Does Marriage Matter?" Demography 32(4):483-507.

[29] Marianne W. Zawitz et. al. 1993. "Highlights from Twenty Years of Surveying Crime Victims." Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

[30] Ronet Bachman. 1994. "Violence Against Women." Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, p. 6.

[31] Caroline Wolf Harlow. 1991. "Female Victims of Violent Crime." Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, p. 6.

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

DAVID POPENOE is Executive Director of the National Marriage Project, a research and public education initiative, at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, where he is also Professor of Sociology and former social sciences dean.

Professor Popenoe specializes in the study of family and community life in modern societies and is the author or editor of nine books. His most recent books are: Life Without Father: Compelling New Evidence that Fatherhood and Marriage are Indispensable for the Good of Children and Society, published in April, 1996, by The Free Press; and Promises to Keep: Decline and Renewal of Marriage in America (co-ed., 1996). Previous books are: Disturbing the Nest: Family Change and Decline in Modern Societies (1988); Housing and Neighborhoods (co-ed., 1987); Private Pleasure, Public Plight: American Metropolitan Community Life in Comparative Perspective (1985/1989); The Suburban Environment: Sweden and the United States (1977); Neighborhood, City and Metropolis (co-ed., 1970); The Urban-Industrial Frontier (ed., 1969); and Sociology (1995), a college textbook first published in 1971 and now in its 10th Anniversary Edition. He also has written numerous scholarly and popular articles, been interviewed by many national newspapers and journals including *The New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Washington Post*, *Los Angeles Times*, *USA Today*, *Time*, *Newsweek*, *U.S. News and World Report*, and *Fortune*, and has frequently appeared on television and radio. His TV and radio appearances include *NBC Nightly News with Tom Brokaw*, *ABC DayOne with Diane Sawyer*, *the Phil Donahue Show*, *the Today Show*, National Public Television's *NewsHour with Jim Lehrer*, and National Public Radio's *All Things Considered*.

As a founder and co-chair (1992-1996) of the Council on Families in America, a national, non-partisan group of scholars and family experts, he was primary author of the Council's 1995 report, Marriage in America: A Report to the Nation. He is a member of the professional advisory board of the National Fatherhood Initiative, is an affiliate of the Civil Society Project, and has been a leader of the family project of the Communitarian Network. Active in many national and international social science and professional associations, he has served on the executive councils of the American Sociological Association's Community and Urban Sociology Section, the International Sociological Association's Housing and Built Environment Research Group, and the Society for the Advancement of Scandinavian Studies, and he is a charter member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. In the 1970s, he was chairman of the board of the American Institute of Family Relations, the nation's first family counseling and research organization, founded by his father in 1930.

Previous professional positions he has held include Associate Dean, for Social and Behavioral Sciences, of the Rutgers Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School; Chairman and Graduate Director of the Department of Sociology at Rutgers; Research Director of the Rutgers Urban Studies Center; visiting professor at New York University, the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Stockholm, the National Swedish Institute for Building Research, and the Centre for Environmental Studies, London; and city planning posts in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Newark, New Jersey.

Professor Popenoe was twice awarded a Senior Fulbright Research Scholarship for research abroad and was a Visiting Fulbright Lecturer in Greece, Israel and Spain. He has been awarded fellowships by the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Scandinavian Foundation, the Government of Sweden, and the Rutgers University Research Council. Born and raised in southern California, he holds the Masters and Doctor of Philosophy degrees from the University of Pennsylvania. He lives with his wife in Princeton, New Jersey, and is the father of two married daughters.

September, 1997

PS 026301

BEST COPY AVAILABLE